

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 050

24

HE 001 890

AUTHOR Knox, John B.; And Others  
 TITLE Class Attendance as a Factor in the Academic Achievement of College Students. Final Report.  
 INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ., Knoxville.  
 SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.  
 BUREAU NO BR-8-D-059  
 PUB DATE 3 Oct 69  
 GRANT OEG-4-8-080059-0046-057  
 NOTE 79p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.05  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Academic Performance, \*Class Attendance, \*Higher Education, \*Independent Study, Learning, Student Characteristics, \*Students

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between student performance and selected learner variables, teacher variables, and variations in teaching-learning environments. Particular attention was given to the identification of learner variables associated with performance in 2 different teaching-learning environments: independent study without student-professor contact and the classroom environment involving student-professor contact in which a combination of lecture and discussion was used. Each student in introductory sociology was allowed to choose whether he would be a regular class attender or whether he would be a non-attender (self-study with attendance only for objective tests). Each of these 2 categories was subsequently divided into (1) those who had performed less well. The differences among these 4 categories on mental, demographic, and social-psychological variables were analyzed using the method of elaboration. Many differences were found between those who chose to attend and not to attend and those of each of these categories whose sociology grade was higher than their GPA. For the total sample, however, there was no significant difference between attenders and non-attenders. (Author/AF)

## CONTENTS

|                                                            |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .                                   | ii |
| SUMMARY . . . . .                                          | 1  |
| 1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY . . . . .                       | 3  |
| 2. METHODS OF RESEARCH . . . . .                           | 7  |
| 3. THE DECISION TO ATTEND AND RELATED FACTORS . . . . .    | 11 |
| 4. EXAMINATION OF DATA FOR INTERACTION EFFECTS . . . . .   | 29 |
| 5. ATTENDANCE AND PERFORMANCE: COMPOSITE FIGURES . . . . . | 33 |
| 6. ATTENDANCE, PERFORMANCE, AND TYPE OF LEARNING . . . . . | 37 |
| 7. STUDENT REPORTS AND EVALUATION . . . . .                | 41 |
| 8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .               | 51 |
| REFERENCES . . . . .                                       | 53 |
| APPENDIX A. DECISION SHEET . . . . .                       | 57 |
| APPENDIX B. PART I, QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .                | 61 |
| APPENDIX C. PART II, QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .               | 75 |
| APPENDIX D. CUTTING POINTS . . . . .                       | 91 |

# LIST OF TABLES

|    |                                                                                    |    |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1  | Attendance and ACT Rank . . . . .                                                  | 13 |
| 2  | ACT Rank and Relative Performance (Attenders) . . . . .                            | 13 |
| 3  | ACT Rank and Relative Performance (Non-Attenders) . . . . .                        | 13 |
| 4  | Attendance and GPA Rank . . . . .                                                  | 14 |
| 5  | GPA Rank and Relative Performance (Attenders) . . . . .                            | 14 |
| 6  | GPA Rank and Relative Performance (Non-Attenders) . . . . .                        | 14 |
| 7  | Attendance and Sociology Percentile . . . . .                                      | 15 |
| 8  | Sociology Percentile and Relative Performance (Attenders) . . . . .                | 15 |
| 9  | Sociology and Relative Performance (Non-Attenders) . . . . .                       | 15 |
| 10 | Number of Home Locations and Attendance . . . . .                                  | 17 |
| 11 | Number of Home Locations and Relative Performance<br>(Attenders) . . . . .         | 17 |
| 12 | Number of Home Locations and Relative Performance<br>(Non-Attenders) . . . . .     | 17 |
| 13 | Father's Occupational Status and Attendance . . . . .                              | 18 |
| 14 | Father's Occupational Status and Relative Performance<br>(Attenders) . . . . .     | 18 |
| 15 | Father's Occupational Status and Relative Performance<br>(Non-Attenders) . . . . . | 18 |
| 16 | College Quarters Completed and Attendance . . . . .                                | 19 |
| 17 | College Quarters Completed and Relative Performance<br>(Attenders) . . . . .       | 19 |
| 18 | College Quarters Completed and Relative Performance<br>(Non-Attenders) . . . . .   | 19 |
| 19 | Living Arrangement and Attendance . . . . .                                        | 20 |
| 20 | Living Arrangement and Relative Performance (Attenders) . . . . .                  | 20 |

ED0 45050

BK 8-D-059  
PA 24

Final Report

Project No. 8-D-059  
Grant No. OEG-4-8 080059-0046-057

CLASS ATTENDANCE AS A FACTOR  
IN THE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

John B. Knox and Louis E. Dotson

with the collaboration of

Ohmer Milton, Jr.

The University of Tennessee

Knoxville, Tennessee

October 3, 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education  
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION  
& WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED  
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR  
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF  
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-  
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 890

|    |                                                                                               |    |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 21 | Living Arrangement and Relative Performance<br>(Non-Attenders) . . . . .                      | 20 |
| 22 | Church Attendance and Class Attendance . . . . .                                              | 22 |
| 23 | Church Attendance and Relative Performance (Attenders) . . . .                                | 22 |
| 24 | Church Attendance and Relative Performance<br>(Non-Attenders) . . . . .                       | 22 |
| 25 | Self-Perception and Attendance . . . . .                                                      | 23 |
| 26 | Self-Perception and Relative Performance (Attenders) . . . . .                                | 23 |
| 27 | Self-Perception and Relative Performance (Non-Attenders) . . .                                | 23 |
| 28 | Age for Errands and Attendance . . . . .                                                      | 24 |
| 29 | Age for Errands and Relative Performance (Attenders) . . . . .                                | 24 |
| 30 | Age for Errands and Relative Performance (Non-Attenders) . . .                                | 24 |
| 31 | Frequency of Errands and Attendance . . . . .                                                 | 25 |
| 32 | Frequency of Errands and Relative Performance<br>(Attenders) . . . . .                        | 25 |
| 33 | Frequency of Errands and Relative Performance<br>(Non-Attenders) . . . . .                    | 25 |
| 34 | Feel Conspicuous and Attendance . . . . .                                                     | 27 |
| 35 | Feel Conspicuous and Relative Performance (Attenders) . . . .                                 | 27 |
| 36 | Feel Conspicuous and Relative Performance<br>(Non-Attenders) . . . . .                        | 27 |
| 37 | Percentage of Students with $S \geq$ GPA by Sex, Professor<br>and Attendance Status . . . . . | 31 |
| 38 | Attendance and Relative Performance (First Quarter<br>Sociology) . . . . .                    | 34 |
| 39 | Attendance and Relative Performance (Professor 1) . . . . .                                   | 34 |
| 40 | Attendance and Relative Performance (Professor 2) . . . . .                                   | 34 |
| 41 | Attendance and Relative Performance (Second Quarter<br>Sociology) . . . . .                   | 35 |

|    |                                                                                            |    |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 42 | Type of Learning: Means for Attenders and Non-Attenders . . . .                            | 39 |
| 43 | Types of Learning: Distribution of Scores by Quartiles . . . .                             | 40 |
| 44 | Hours of Study and Attendance . . . . .                                                    | 42 |
| 45 | Hours of Study and Relative Performance (Atenders) . . .                                   | 42 |
| 46 | Hours of Study and Relative Performance (Non-Atenders) . . .                               | 42 |
| 47 | Study Frequency and Attendance . . . . .                                                   | 43 |
| 48 | Study Frequency and Relative Performance (Atenders) . . .                                  | 43 |
| 49 | Study Frequency and Relative Performance (Non-Atenders) . . .                              | 43 |
| 50 | Forming Friendships and Relative Performance (Atenders) . . .                              | 44 |
| 51 | Forming Friendships and Relative Performance (Non-Atenders) . . .                          | 44 |
| 52 | Relative Performance of Non-Atenders Who Reported . . . . .<br>Studying Other Courses More | 46 |
| 53 | Test Grades and Relative Performance (Atenders) . . . . .                                  | 47 |
| 54 | Test Grades and Relative Performance (Non-Atenders) . . . . .                              | 47 |
| 55 | Would You Make the Same Decision Again? . . . . .                                          | 48 |
| 56 | Above Question and Relative Performance (Atenders) . . . . .                               | 48 |
| 57 | Above Question and Relative Performance (Non-Atenders) . . . . .                           | 48 |
| 58 | Above Question and GPA Percentile (Atenders) . . . . .                                     | 49 |
| 59 | Above Question and GPA Percentile (Non-Atenders) . . . . .                                 | 49 |

## SUMMARY

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between student performance and selected learner variables, teacher variables, and variations in teaching-learning environments. Particular attention is given to the identification of learner variables associated with performance in two different teaching-learning environments--independent study without student-professor contact and the classroom environment involving student-professor contact in which a combination of lecture and discussion is used.

The procedure was to permit each student in introductory sociology to choose whether he would be a regular class attender or whether he would be a non-attender (self-study with attendance only for objective tests). Each of these two categories was subsequently dichotomized into (1) those who had performed as well or better in sociology than their grade point average, and (2) those who had performed less well. The result was four categories: attenders whose Soc percentile  $\geq$  GPA percentile; attenders whose Soc percentile  $<$  GPA percentile; non-attenders whose Soc percentile  $\geq$  GPA percentile; non-attenders whose Soc percentile  $<$  GPA percentile. The differences among these four categories on mental, demographic and social-psychological variables were analyzed using the method of elaboration.

Many differences were found between those who chose to attend and not to attend and those of each of these categories who had Soc  $\geq$  GPA. The non-attenders with Soc  $\geq$  GPA were found to have a number of identifiable characteristics.

However, for the total samples (602 students in the first quarter of the course and 195 in the second quarter) there was no significant difference between attenders and non-attenders. This finding, combined with those mentioned above, support the major thesis of this research: that individual differences influence the student's need for regular class attendance. To state that there is no significant difference between attenders and non-attenders is an over-simplification.

A study of the performance of attenders and non-attenders on test items classified as factual, conceptual and generalizing provided some evidence that attenders and non-attenders are engaged in different types of learning. More study of this subject is recommended.

## BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Undergraduate colleges were established in Colonial America, beginning with Harvard, William and Mary, and Yale. They followed the British pattern, but with stronger emphasis upon Puritan rigor. Except for one or two periods designated for recreation, the college day was spent in class periods, study periods and chapel exercises. In the evenings and at other times students were expected to be in their rooms studying, and "tutors made regular rounds to guard against the devil's finding occupations for idle minds."<sup>1</sup>

In the eighteenth century state universities began to appear upon the scene and in the nineteenth century Land Grant Colleges. Religious influence was never strong in these secular institutions, and it has declined in the colleges which were established under church auspices. Also, in the nineteenth century the system of close regulation of students' time was challenged by influence from Continental Europe, especially from Germany. In 1886 Harvard "adopted the continental philosophy of student life in toto by announcing that attendance at classes would no longer be taken for juniors and seniors and that they would be required to pass only course examinations."<sup>2</sup> Under this system the student was free to do as he pleased during the college year from registration to final examination, a system somewhat similar to that currently existing in British universities.

Current practices in U.S. universities vary, showing some characteristics of both systems. This is especially evident in the requirements for undergraduate, and to some extent for graduate, degrees. The legal tender exchangeable for a degree is of two types: a certain number of units or credit hours acquired in lecture or laboratory and satisfactory performance on examinations.

College faculties appear to be divided into what may be called the Garfield School (Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and a student on the other) and the Galileo School (you cannot teach a man anything; you can only help him to find it within

---

<sup>1</sup>John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), p. 81.

<sup>2</sup>Edward Bradby, The University Outside Europe (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), pp. 58-59.

himself).<sup>3</sup> If the Galileo School is correct, many millions of faculty-student hours are being wasted in the classroom. If the Garfield School is right, some current practices in colleges will result in inferior education, even though the students may pass their examinations and secure degrees.

At the present time we are faced nationally with an under supply of faculty for colleges and universities and a great increase in the number of students. The scarcity of faculty leads administrations to search for ways to eliminate waste of time and duplication of effort. At the same time, especially in the larger institutions, there is a wide-spread apprehension of growing impersonality in education (dramatized by events at Berkeley in 1964-65 and in many other institutions since). It thus appears that in 1969 we are still (or again?) engaged in the battle, begun more than a century ago, between those who minimize the importance of student-faculty contact and those who emphasize the danger of impersonality in education.

Considerable attention has been given to the basic question: Do contact hours with the professor assist in the learning process? Research bearing upon this question has been conducted at a number of institutions, including Antioch College, the University of Colorado, Miami University (Ohio), Purdue University and the University of Tennessee. For the most part the systematic studies conducted at these institutions indicate no significant difference between performance of students who attended regular classes (usually three times per week) and those who studied more independently with fewer contacts or no contact except for examinations.

Implicit in the long-continued debate over student-professor contact and in much of the research (possibly even more in the minds of those who interpret it) is the assumption that the student is a standardized person. Such an assumption is contrary to our basic knowledge of individual differences. Because of individual differences of students it may be that within a single university and in the same course, we need different plans for student-faculty contact hours. This is the assumption from which we proceed. It is similar to the position arrived at by Siegel and Siegel, but our focus is different. It is upon

---

<sup>3</sup>The statement about Mark Hopkins originated with James A. Garfield in an address given at Williams College, 1871. Burton Stevenson, ed., The Home Book of Quotations: Classical and Modern (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1956), p. 2069. The second statement is attributed to Galileo. See Jacob M. Braude, Speakers Encyclopedia of Stories, Quotations and Anecdotes (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955), p. 133.

classroom instruction in a traditional setting.<sup>4</sup> If this and subsequent studies can specify which students learn equally well in certain courses with less class attendance, the result should be an improvement in the teaching process for students who need professor contact and a saving in teaching time and cost.

In summary, the purpose of our research is to examine the relationship between student performance and selected learner variables, teacher variables, and variations in teaching-learning environments. Particular attention is to be given to the identification of learner variables associated with performance in two different teaching-learning environments--independent study without student-professor contact and the classroom environment involving student-professor contact in which a combination of lecture and discussion is used.

---

<sup>4</sup>Laurence Siegel and Lila C. Siegel, "A Multivariate Paradigm for Educational Research," Psychological Bulletin, 68:5, pp. 306-326.

## METHODS OF RESEARCH

With the data collected in this study it would be possible to study a large number of different and important questions. In the interest of precision the report will be limited to the question of class attendance as a factor in student achievement in two samples of college undergraduates in introductory sociology at the University of Tennessee.

To explore the problem defined the researchers began collection of data at the University of Tennessee in the Winter Quarter, January, 1967. At the first class meeting of each of their sections of introductory sociology the students were told that at the fourth meeting they would have to decide whether they wished to be attenders or non-attenders. (See Appendix A). Details of the plan were discussed with the students as much as they wished during the first four class meetings. The attenders were expected to be present and prepared at every class unless they had an exceptionally good excuse. After the introductory week the non-attenders could not come to class (or receive any assistance from the professor) except for the two major tests, the final examination, and the two class periods discussed below.

At a class meeting one week after each of the tests both attenders and non-attenders were required to be present to learn their test grades and to supply information required on two questionnaires (Appendices B and C) and to discuss the test questions. It was felt that all students should have this much feed-back from the professor. After the first test a non-attender could change to the status of attender if he wished. Only three students availed themselves of this option--a number too small to permit statistical analysis.

A final grade based upon 30% for each of the two tests and 40% for the final examination was computed for each student at the end of the course. The grade so computed is the grade used as evidence of course performance.

The questionnaires contain items requesting demographic information and items designed to indicate social-psychological characteristics. They also contain a few items which will be used in studies other than this one.

The second questionnaire asked a number of questions calling for student evaluation of his experiences as an attender or

non-attender. This questionnaire was administered and retained by a representative of the University's Learning Research Center. The professor was not permitted to see the responses until after he had completed and turned in the grades for the course, thus contributing to frankness of response from the students. Examination of the responses after the students' grades had been recorded indicated that they had responded confidently.

Collection of data using the instruments indicated continued through May 1968, at which time we had information on approximately 800 students, 602, in the first quarter of introductory sociology and 195 in the second quarter. For some of the tables the totals are smaller than these figures because there was no information available on the item being treated. Most of the analysis relates to the larger sample of 602 subjects.

Each student's standing on ACT Test and Grade Point Average for the quarter in which he took sociology was secured from the University records and a percentile rank on each of these variables as well as his percentile rank in sociology was determined.

The three percentile scores along with all the information secured on Parts I and II of the Questionnaire (Appendices B and C) were coded and put on punch cards. The students were then divided into two categories:

- a. Those whose percentile rank in sociology was equal to or above percentile rank of GPA. .
- b. Those whose percentile rank in sociology was below percentile rank on GPA. .

To clarify relationships most of the responses to questions permitting multiple responses were reduced to two categories. For example in question 16 of Part II (Appendix C) "strongly agree" and "agree" was combined for one category, "undecided," "disagree" and "strongly disagree" for the other. Most of the data are presented in 2 x 2 contingency tables with the probability based upon a chi square ( $X^2$ ) value and the strength of the relationship expressed by epsilon ( $\epsilon$ ). The contingency tables were run and the chi square values computed by the University of Tennessee Computer Center.

Several variables other than those under study needed to be controlled, and controls were planned as follows:

- a. Subject matter: The same textbook and assignments were used over the two year period covered by the study. The book used was: Broom, Leonard and

Philip Selznick, Sociology (Third Edition), New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

- b. Tests: Only objective tests (true-false and multiple choice items) were used on the regular tests. Except for items relating to material discussed in the first four class periods, all test questions were taken from the Instructor's Manual designed for use with the text and distributed by the publishers.
- c. Teaching: Only two teachers were involved in the study. They endeavored to use the same teaching methods, which were a combination of lecture and discussion. Some differences between the two professors are given in Chapter 4.
- d. Discipline and level of course: The study was done only for two quarters of the introductory course and for only one discipline.

In summary, the above is the research method which was followed. Other details of the method will become clear in the following chapters which report analysis of data and findings.

### THE DECISION TO ATTEND AND RELATED FACTORS

As mentioned earlier, at the fourth meeting of the class each student was asked to sign a statement that he had decided to be an attender or a non-attender. This dichotomy is one of our basic variables. It is a dependent variable insofar as it may have been influenced by mental, demographic or social-psychological characteristics of the student. It is independent insofar as it may have influenced performance in the course.

In this study performance is measured in two ways, only one of which is referred to in this chapter. The measure treated here is a comparison between the percentile rank of the student in sociology and the percentile rank of his grade point average for the quarter in which he studied sociology. Thus, each student's performance in sociology is compared with his total performance, not with the performance of other students. On this basis the students are dichotomized into the categories "Students with Soc  $\geq$  GPA" or Students with Soc  $<$  GPA."

In most of the tables at the top of the following pages the relationship between attendance and some one mental, demographic or social-psychological factor is presented. And below this the relationship between variable attenders which is being considered and relative performance (Soc  $\geq$  GPA or Soc  $<$  GPA), is presented in partial tables for attenders and non-attenders.

Tables are included only if one of the three has a distribution which would be expected to occur by chance less than one time in 20. ( $p < .05$ ). If such is the case for one table all three are presented so that comparison can be made.

On the basis of the evidence to be examined we can state whether students with a given characteristic probably made a wise decision to attend or not to attend or whether it probably made no difference.

#### Mental Characteristics.

Perhaps the most important independent measure that we have of mental ability is students' ACT score (American College Testing Program). The composite score has been found to be the best indicator of performance in social science courses and this is the score used in our study.

As indicated in Table 1, students with lower ACT rank are more likely to choose to be attenders, but the relationship is not strong. For the attenders there is no significant difference between ACT rank and Soc  $\geq$  GPA. (Tables 2, 3). For the non-attenders, however, there is a strong relationship between ACT rank and Soc  $\geq$  GPA. This is the first indication of what we may find is a profile of the successful non-attender.

Grade Point Average is the best measure of student's performance as student, including mental ability, industry and probably many other elusive factors. There is no significant relationship between GPA and the decision to attend, but for both attenders and non-attenders the relationship between GPA and relative performance is statistically significant. (Tables 4, 5, 6). On reflection it is not surprising that the students with lower GPA are more likely to have S  $\geq$  GPA. A student whose GPA is high must reach even higher to surpass it in sociology. A student whose GPA is low does not have to reach so high. Tables 5 and 6, for all their statistical significance, probably have no important meaning except to suggest that attending may increase the chances of the student with low GPA.

The final measure that we have of mental ability is the student's grade in sociology, which has been reduced to percentile rank for reasons already mentioned. Again, we find no significant relationship between standing high in sociology and relative performance in sociology. (Tables 7, 8, 9). This is perhaps not surprising in the light of the discussion of the preceding paragraph. It is perhaps worth pointing out that the relationship between GPA and relative performance is much stronger for attenders while that between sociology percentile and relative performance is much stronger for non-attenders.

Perhaps the most important finding of this section is that there is no significant relation between any of our three measures of mental ability and the decision to attend. The relationships are so weak as to deserve little or no attention. If special characteristics of those who decided to attend are to be ascertained, we must examine the demographic and social-psychological characteristics of the students.

#### Demographic Characteristics.

The influence of demographic characteristics is probably social-psychological in nature. However, if a social-psychological

# ATTENDANCE, ACT RANK, AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

TABLE 1

|    |  | ACT<br>1-50% | ACT<br>51-100% e |   |
|----|--|--------------|------------------|---|
| A  |  | 194          | 127              | 7 |
|    |  | 69%          | 62%              |   |
| NA |  | 89           | 79               | 7 |
|    |  | 31%          | 38%              |   |
|    |  | 283          | 206              |   |

$$\chi^2 = 2.5173; p < .2$$

TABLE 2

|                     |  | A            |                  |   |
|---------------------|--|--------------|------------------|---|
|                     |  | ACT<br>1-50% | ACT<br>51-100% e |   |
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ |  | 91           | 63               | 3 |
|                     |  | 47%          | 50%              |   |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    |  | 103          | 64               | 3 |
|                     |  | 53%          | 50%              |   |
|                     |  | 194          | 127              |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.2240; p < .7$$

TABLE 3

|                     |  | NA           |                  |    |
|---------------------|--|--------------|------------------|----|
|                     |  | ACT<br>1-50% | ACT<br>51-100% e |    |
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ |  | 37           | 48               | 19 |
|                     |  | 42%          | 61%              |    |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    |  | 52           | 31               | 19 |
|                     |  | 58%          | 39%              |    |
|                     |  | 89           | 79               |    |

$$\chi^2 = 6.1634; p < .02$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender;  $S \geq \text{GPA}$  = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S < \text{GPA}$  = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, the first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

# ATTENDANCE, GPA RANK, AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

TABLE 4

|    | GPA<br>1-50% | GPA<br>51-100% e |   |
|----|--------------|------------------|---|
| A  | 195<br>65%   | 191<br>63%       | 2 |
| NA | 104<br>35%   | 112<br>37%       | 2 |

$$\chi^2 = 0.3112; p < .7$$

TABLE 5

|                     | GPA<br>1-50% | GPA<br>51-100% e |    |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------|----|
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 126<br>65%   | 60<br>31%        | 34 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 69<br>35%    | 131<br>69%       | 34 |
|                     | 195          | 191              |    |

$$\chi^2 = 42.6025; p < .001$$

TABLE 6

|                     | GPA<br>1-50% | GPA<br>51-100% e |    |
|---------------------|--------------|------------------|----|
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 62<br>60%    | 50<br>45%        | 15 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 42<br>40%    | 62<br>55%        | 15 |
|                     | 104          | 112              |    |

$$\chi^2 = 4.8422; p < .05$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender;  $S \geq \text{GPA}$  = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S < \text{GPA}$  = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, the first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

# ATTENDANCE, SOCIOLOGY STANDING, AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

TABLE 7

|    |  | Soc%<br>1-50% | Soc %<br>51-100% e |   |
|----|--|---------------|--------------------|---|
| A  |  | 213           | 173                |   |
|    |  | 66%           | 62%                | 4 |
| NA |  | 109           | 107                |   |
|    |  | 34%           | 38%                | 4 |
|    |  | 322           | 280                |   |

$$\chi^2 = 1.2394; p < .3$$

TABLE 8

|         |  | A             |                   |    |
|---------|--|---------------|-------------------|----|
|         |  | Soc%<br>1-50% | Soc%<br>51-100% e |    |
| S ≥ GPA |  | 93            | 93                | 10 |
|         |  | 44%           | 54%               |    |
| S < GPA |  | 120           | 80                | 10 |
|         |  | 56%           | 46%               |    |
|         |  | 213           | 173               |    |

$$\chi^2 = 3.8968; p < .05$$

TABLE 9

|         |  | NA            |                   |    |
|---------|--|---------------|-------------------|----|
|         |  | Soc%<br>1-50% | Soc%<br>51-100% e |    |
| S ≥ GPA |  | 38            | 74                | 34 |
|         |  | 35%           | 69%               |    |
| S < GPA |  | 71            | 33                | 34 |
|         |  | 65%           | 31%               |    |
|         |  | 109           | 107               |    |

$$\chi^2 = 25.4397; p < .001$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S ≥ GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

linkage is not generally recognized, we have classified the variable as demographic.

The variable number of houses lived in (homes) prior to age 18 is not significantly related to the decision to attend or to performance of attenders. (Tables 10 and 11). However, for non-attenders there is a fairly strong positive relation between number of houses and performance. (Table 12). Perhaps family mobility has given the student experience in self-reliance and independent work.

In the case of father's occupation (Tables 13, 14, 15) there is a relation between status of father's occupation and the decision to attend but not between father's occupation and performance for either attenders or non-attenders. Children of fathers with white-collar occupations were more likely to choose to be non-attenders.

The two demographic factors mentioned above are antecedent to and somewhat apart from the student's life in college. Two significant factors which relate more closely to his college life are the number of quarters of college work completed prior to the quarter in which sociology was taken and living arrangement at the University.

It is not surprising that students who had completed two or more quarters of college were more likely to choose to be non-attenders. (Table 16). It may be surprising that for both attenders and non-attenders there is no significant relationship between number of quarters completed and course performance. (Tables 17, 18). For attenders the relationship is just below the .05 level of significance and it is negative.

As for living arrangements, the data indicated that students who live in an apartment or rented room with one or more other people are more likely to choose to be non-attenders. (Table 19). There is no significant relation between relative course performance and living arrangement. (Tables 20, 21).

Relationships between age of student, as well as size of home town and the decision to attend, were not significant at the .05 level. Relationships with sex, age, and other demographic variables were weaker.

In summary, it is clear that students whose fathers held higher status occupations, who had been in college for more than one quarter, and who lived independently were more likely to be non-attenders. The evidence is that the relative course performance of these students was not less because of non-attendance. Perhaps they as well as the attenders decided wisely, each for himself.

# NUMBER OF HOME LOCATIONS, ATTENDANCE AND PERFORMANCE

(QI-21)

TABLE 10

|    | Many       | Few        | e |
|----|------------|------------|---|
| A  | 144<br>62% | 233<br>65% | 3 |
| NA | 87<br>38%  | 125<br>35% | 3 |
|    | 231        | 358        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.4596; p < .5$$

TABLE 11

|              | Many      | Few        | e |
|--------------|-----------|------------|---|
| A            |           |            |   |
| S $\geq$ GPA | 71<br>49% | 108<br>46% | 3 |
| S $<$ GPA    | 73<br>51% | 125<br>54% | 3 |
|              | 144       | 233        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.3113; p < .7$$

TABLE 12

|              | Many      | Few       | e  |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|----|
| NA           |           |           |    |
| S $\geq$ GPA | 52<br>60% | 57<br>46% | 14 |
| S $<$ GPA    | 35<br>40% | 68<br>54% | 14 |
|              | 87        | 125       |    |

$$\chi^2 = 4.1233; p < .05$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S  $\geq$  GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S  $<$  GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

FATHER'S: OCCUPATIONAL STATUS, ATTENDANCE, AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

Father's Job (I-20)

(QI-10)

TABLE 13

|    | Low        | High       | e |
|----|------------|------------|---|
| A  | 103<br>61% | 273<br>61% | 0 |
| NA | 41<br>39%  | 171<br>39% | 0 |
|    | 144        | 444        |   |

$$\chi^2 = -4.7553; p < .05$$

TABLE 14

|         | A         |            | e  |
|---------|-----------|------------|----|
|         | Low       | High       |    |
| S ≥ GPA | 46<br>45% | 136<br>50% | 15 |
| S < GPA | 57<br>55% | 137<br>50% | 15 |
|         | 103       | 273        |    |

$$\chi^2 = 0.7962; p < .5$$

TABLE 15

|         | NA        |           | e |
|---------|-----------|-----------|---|
|         | Low       | High      |   |
| S ≥ GPA | 20<br>49% | 89<br>52% | 3 |
| S < GPA | 21<br>51% | 82<br>48% | 3 |
|         | 41        | 171       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.1412; p < .8$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attenders; S ≥ GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

COLLEGE QUARTERS COMPLETED, ATTENDANCE, AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

(QI-7)

TABLE 16

Many Quarters (2-6)      Few Quarters (0-1)

|    | Many Quarters (2-6) | Few Quarters (0-1) | e  |
|----|---------------------|--------------------|----|
| A  | 267<br>61%          | 110<br>73%         | 12 |
| NA | 173<br>39%          | 40<br>27%          | 12 |
|    | 440                 | 150                |    |

$$\chi^2 = 7.7618; p < .01$$

TABLE 17

|              | Many Quarters | Few Quarters | e  |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|----|
| S $\geq$ GPA | 120<br>45%    | 61<br>55%    | 10 |
| S < GPA      | 147<br>55%    | 49<br>45%    | 10 |
|              | 267           | 110          |    |

$$\chi^2 = 3.4481; p < .1$$

TABLE 18

|              | Many Quarters | Few Quarters | e |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| S $\geq$ GPA | 89<br>51%     | 22<br>55%    | 4 |
| S < GPA      | 84<br>49%     | 18<br>45%    | 4 |
|              | 173           | 40           |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.1645; p < .7$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S  $\geq$  GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

# LIVING ARRANGEMENT, ATTENDANCE, AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

(QI-41)

TABLE 19

|    | Other      | Apt. etc. | e  |
|----|------------|-----------|----|
| A  | 331<br>65% | 38<br>52% | 13 |
| NA | 174<br>35% | 35<br>48% | 13 |
|    | 505        | 73        |    |

$$\chi^2 = 5.0278; p < .05$$

TABLE 20

|                     | Other      | A<br>Apt. etc. | e |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|---|
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 154<br>47% | 20<br>53%      | 6 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 177<br>53% | 18<br>47%      | 6 |
|                     | 331        | 38             |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.5100; p < .5$$

TABLE 21

|                     | Other     | NA<br>Apt. etc. | e  |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------------|----|
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 87<br>50% | 21<br>60%       | 10 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 87<br>50% | 14<br>40%       | 10 |
|                     | 174       | 35              |    |

$$\chi^2 = 1.1669; p < .3$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender;  $S \geq \text{GPA}$  = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S < \text{GPA}$  = the opposite; QI-I = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

### Social-Psychological Variables.

Frequency of church attendance is treated as indicative of a social-psychological characteristic (possibly conformity) and not as having any other meaning. Students who report attending church twice a month or more often are much more likely to decide to be attenders than those who go to church less often. (Table 22). However, among both attenders and non-attenders those who go to church often are less likely to have  $Soc \geq GPA$ . (Table 23, 24). Among attenders the relationship is not significant at the .05 level but among non-attenders  $p < .01$  and almost at the .001 level. It may be that mental conformity, as evidenced by class attendance and church attendance, is antithetical to the study of sociology. Perhaps the sociological perspective is so different from the conventional perspective that the conventional mind finds the former difficult to grasp. If this is the explanation, we would not expect a negative relationship between church attendance and performance to be found in other disciplines.

In Questionnaire I-26, the student was asked to give in retrospect a perception of himself during his senior year in high school. Since most of the students were college freshmen or sophomores, we may assume that a self-perception which was accurate one or two years earlier would not be very different from a self-perception when this questionnaire was answered. The question was asked with reference to the past because it was felt that students might be more willing to respond about the past than the present. Only 424 out of 602 felt that they fitted into one of the four categories described. Those who classified themselves as "the high-achieving studious" were much more likely to choose to be attenders. (Table 25). But these, whether attenders or non-attenders, were not very likely to have  $Soc \geq GPA$ . (Tables 26, 27). Possibly their GPA's were so high that this was too difficult to achieve.

These are the only social-psychological characteristics which distinguish between attenders and non-attenders with a  $p < .05$ . As regards relative performance, none of the social-psychological characteristics are significantly related to performance for attenders, but several do have a significant relation for non-attenders.

Two of these have to do with running errands, which has been regarded as one means by which the child may become independent and develop a strong need for achievement. For these subjects the reverse seems to have been the case. Those who were sent on errands early and often are slightly, but not significantly, more likely to become non-attenders. (Tables 28, 31). But those who were sent on errands early and

# CHURCH ATTENDANCE, CLASS ATTENDANCE, AND PERFORMANCE

(QI-5)

TABLE 22

|    | High       | Low        | e  |
|----|------------|------------|----|
| A  | 247<br>69% | 138<br>57% | 12 |
| NA | 110<br>31% | 106<br>43% | 12 |
|    | 357        | 244        |    |

$$\chi^2 = 10.0426; p < .01$$

TABLE 23

|         | A          |           | e |
|---------|------------|-----------|---|
|         | High       | Low       |   |
| S ≥ GPA | 111<br>45% | 74<br>54% | 9 |
| S < GPA | 136<br>55% | 64<br>46% | 9 |
|         | 247        | 138       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 2.6746; p < .2$$

TABLE 24

|         | NA        |           | e  |
|---------|-----------|-----------|----|
|         | High      | Low       |    |
| S ≥ GPA | 46<br>42% | 66<br>62% | 10 |
| S < GPA | 64<br>58% | 40<br>38% | 10 |
|         | 110       | 106       |    |

$$\chi^2 = 9.0389; p < .01$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S ≥ GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

# SELF-PERCEPTION, ATTENDANCE, AND PERFORMANCE

(QI-26)

TABLE 25

|    | A         |            | e  |
|----|-----------|------------|----|
|    | Studious  | Other      |    |
| A  | 74<br>75% | 206<br>62% | 13 |
| NA | 26<br>21% | 124<br>38% | 13 |
|    | 94        | 330        |    |

$$\chi^2 = 4.6705; p < .05$$

TABLE 26

|                     | A         |            | e |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|---|
|                     | Studious  | Other      |   |
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 30<br>43% | 104<br>50% | 7 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 40<br>51% | 102<br>50% | 7 |
|                     | 70        | 206        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 1.2171; p < .3$$

TABLE 27

|                     | NA        |           | e |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---|
|                     | Studious  | Other     |   |
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 14<br>60% | 66<br>53% | 7 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 10<br>40% | 58<br>47% | 7 |
|                     | 24        | 124       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.2112; p < .7$$

A = Attender; NA = Attender;  $S \geq \text{GPA}$  = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S < \text{GPA}$  = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

# AGE FOR ERRANDS, ATTENDANCE, AND PERFORMANCE

(QI-20)

TABLE 28

|    | Young      | Old        | e |
|----|------------|------------|---|
| A  | 247<br>63% | 126<br>65% | 2 |
| NA | 144<br>37% | 68<br>35%  | 2 |
|    | 391        | 194        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.1772; p < .7$$

TABLE 29

|                     | Young      | Old       | e |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|---|
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 124<br>50% | 56<br>44% | 6 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 123<br>50% | 70<br>56% | 6 |
|                     | 247        | 126       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 1.1079; p < .3$$

TABLE 30

|                     | Young     | Old       | e  |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----|
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 68<br>47% | 42<br>62% | 15 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 76<br>53% | 26<br>38% | 15 |
|                     | 144       | 68        |    |

$$\chi^2 = -3.9128; p < .05$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender;  $S \geq \text{GPA}$  = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S < \text{GPA}$  = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

# FREQUENCY OF ERRANDS, ATTENDANCE AND PERFORMANCE

(QI-19)

TABLE 31

|    | Freq.      | Not Freq.  | e |
|----|------------|------------|---|
| A  | 272<br>63% | 112<br>66% | 3 |
| NA | 157<br>37% | 58<br>34%  | 3 |

$$x^2 = 0.3252; p < .7$$

TABLE 32

|                     | A          |           |   |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|---|
|                     | Freq.      | Not Freq. | e |
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 137<br>50% | 48<br>43% | 7 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 135<br>50% | 64<br>57% | 7 |
|                     | 272        | 112       |   |

$$x^2 = 1.7924; p < .2$$

TABLE 33

|                     | NA        |           |    |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----|
|                     | Freq.     | Not Freq. | e  |
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 74<br>47% | 38<br>66% | 19 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 83<br>53% | 20<br>34% | 19 |
|                     | 157       | 58        |    |

$$x^2 = 5.7354; p < .02$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender;  $S \geq \text{GPA}$  = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S < \text{GPA}$  = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

often and who became non-attenders are significantly less likely to have Soc  $\geq$  GPA. (Tables 30, 33). If they had a strong need for achievement, the achievement was not made in sociology.

A similar situation is found in response to the statement: "I would feel conspicuous if I were not dressed the way most of my friends are dressed." Responses of attenders and non-attenders were not significantly different. (Table 34). But among non-attenders those who disagreed with the statement were significantly more likely to have Soc  $\geq$  GPA. (Table 36).

On a number of the questions relating to social-psychological factors the variables differed with a probability only slightly greater than .05. There is a distinct possibility that study of combinations of these, in the light of existing theory, would clarify further the problem being explored.

# FEEL CONSPICUOUS, ATTENDANCE AND PERFORMANCE

(QII-21)

TABLE 34

|    | Agree      | Disagree   | e |
|----|------------|------------|---|
| A  | 211<br>65% | 173<br>63% | 2 |
| NA | 113<br>35% | 102<br>37% | 2 |
|    | 324        | 275        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.3170; p < .7$$

TABLE 35

|                     | A          |           | e |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|---|
|                     | Agree      | Disagree  |   |
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 98<br>46%  | 88<br>51% | 5 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 113<br>54% | 85<br>49% | 5 |
|                     | 211        | 173       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.7441; p < .5$$

TABLE 36

|                     | NA        |           | e  |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----|
|                     | Agree     | Disagree  |    |
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 51<br>45% | 61<br>60% | 15 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 62<br>55% | 41<br>40% | 15 |
|                     | 113       | 102       |    |

$$\chi^2 = 4.6237; p < .05$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender;  $S \geq \text{GPA}$  = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S < \text{GPA}$  = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

## EXAMINATION OF DATA FOR INTERACTION EFFECTS

The previous chapters dealt with the independent effects of selected variables on (1) the choice of attending or not attending class and on (2) students' relative performance. This section examines the data for possible interaction effects or combined effects among the selected independent variables on student performance. The model used in testing for interaction was developed for use with attribute data by Coleman and Robertson.<sup>1</sup> The interaction model is an extension of Coleman's<sup>2</sup> least squares model that provides parameters which estimate the additive effects of selected independent variables considered simultaneously. In the Coleman-Robertson model the interaction effects are estimated in much the same way as main effects in the original Coleman multivariate model.

In a table of proportions of persons in a given state of the dependent variate by states of the independent variates such as those in the present study the estimate is the average of the difference in proportions between cells in which interaction (or main effect) should increase the proportion and cells in which interaction (or main effect) should decrease the proportions. These are the same comparisons one would do in an analysis of variance with one observation per cell.<sup>3</sup>

In this analysis, the three independent variable model was utilized. The variables examined were dichotomized in the same manner as in the tables in Chapter 3.

There was almost an infinite number of ways that the variables in the study could be combined into sets of three for analysis. Thus the writers make no claim for an exhaustive study. There is no significant body of theory to serve as a guide in combining the variables into meaningful sets, and

---

<sup>1</sup>James S. Coleman and Leon S. Robertson, "Multivariate Analysis," a seminar held at The Johns Hopkins University, December, 1965.

<sup>2</sup>James S. Coleman, Introduction to Mathematical Sociology (New York: Free Press, 1964), pp. 189-240.

<sup>3</sup>Leon S. Robertson, personal correspondence, January, 1966.

empirical studies which generally deal with but two variables are of limited value in this respect. Therefore in the absence of a better rationale the variables were combined as follows: (1) Inasmuch as the primary independent variable in this study was the attendance status of students, it was included in most of the three variable sets analyzed. (2) Variables amenable to dichotomization were added to sets according to their sequential order on the data cards.

In the interest of brevity and because of the exploratory nature of this analysis, data for only one set of variables are to be presented. The findings, however, for the other sets are reported in the summaries below.

No significant interaction effects on relative performance were found among birth order (dichotomized between first born and other), age at which money was first earned, and attendance. Likewise no combination of the dichotomized variables (1) father's education, (2) sex of subject, and (3) number of quarters of college work completed (divided between two and three or more quarters) was found to significantly affect student performance. Similarly no significant interaction was evidenced between (1) inner-other directedness and attendance status, (2) sex of student and attendance, (3) attendance and professor, (4) authoritarianism (F-scale) and attendance, and (5) authoritarianism and church attendance.

Variables influencing student performance through significant interaction effects are as follows: (1) frequency of running errands and age at first job; (2) frequency of running errands and attendance; (3) frequency of running errands, age at first job, and attendance; (4) amount of time studied and attendance; (5) preference for being with others while waiting to take an exam, amount of time studied, and attendance status; (6) frequency of church attendance and age; (7) size of graduating class and population of home town, and (8) amount of time studied and inner-other directedness. Most of these findings are reflected in the chi-square analysis of the preceding section. In these cases the direction of the influence is identical for both analyses.

Table 37 shows the proportion of subjects having  $S \geq$  GPA for each state of the three independent variables--sex of subject, professor, attendance status. Two significant interaction effects appear among these variables: (1) between sex and subject and professor and (2) among all three independent variables. The data indicate that the

TABLE 37

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH  $S \geq$  GPA BY  
SEX, PROFESSOR, AND ATTENDANCE STATUS

| Professor<br>Attendance<br>Sex of Subject | Prof. 1          |                        | Prof. 2          |                        |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
|                                           | attender<br>male | non-attender<br>female | attender<br>male | non-attender<br>female |
| Percent                                   | 48.3%            | 53.2%                  | 46.5%            | 45.3%                  |
| N                                         | 43               | 41                     | 47               | 29                     |
| TOTAL                                     | 89               | 77                     | 101              | 64                     |

Interaction Parameters

Sex and Attendance = 0.0165  
Sex and Professor = 0.0997  
Attendance and Professor = 0.0403  
Sex, Attendance and Professor = 0.0712

p > .05  
p < .05  
p > .05  
p < .05

performance of females was better than males in Prof. 1 classes regardless of attendance and that the performance of males was better than females in Prof. 2 classes regardless of attendance. Further, male attenders performed somewhat better than male non-attenders in Prof. 1 classes whereas the reverse was true with Prof. 2. Inasmuch as grades were assigned without the professor's knowledge of the name, sex, and attendance status of the student, bias on the part of the professor can be ruled out. Thus these data support the idea that students vary in their response to teachers and to learning environments.

The two professors engaged in the study were rather fully in agreement as to their approach to sociology. Also, as mentioned earlier, they endeavored to use the same teaching method, which was a combination of lecture and discussion.

The professors were both male, but differed in some other demographic characteristics. At the time data collecting was begun (January, 1967), Prof. 1 was 43 years of age, Prof. 2 was 57. Prof. 1 was married and the father of three sons, ages 16, 14, and 10. Prof. 2 was a bachelor. Prof. 1 was short (64 inches) with a full head of hair and rather active; Prof. 2 was slightly taller (67½ inches) balding and less active. What effect these and other personal characteristics have upon student's perception of and response to the professor cannot be determined from our data.

## ATTENDANCE AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE: COMPOSITE FIGURES

Most other studies of attendance, non-attendance and course performance have compared grades, usually mean grades, of the two categories and have found no significant difference. In some cases the students have been arbitrarily assigned to attend or non-attend categories. This study differs in that it compares each student's sociology grade with his GPA, thus giving an indication of his relative performance. Also, the students were permitted to choose whether they would be attenders or non-attenders, on the assumption that the students differ in their need for explanation and class discussion. Also, it was felt that their self-perception in this respect may be accurate in a high proportion of cases.

As indicated in Table 38, there is no significant difference in the relative performance of attenders and non-attenders. When separated for the two professors the finding is the same. (Tables 39, 40). Also, the finding is the same for the category of 195 students in the second quarter of introductory sociology, who were all taught by the same professor. (Table 41).

This uniform finding seems to permit one or more of three interpretations. First, perhaps class attendance is not important to learning the type of material covered by the true-false and multiple choice test questions used. Second, perhaps class attendance is important, but the student's self-perception of need for class attendance was good, and consequently those who needed classroom guidance chose to attend and those who did not chose to be non-attenders. Review of the relationship between relative performance and the mental, demographic, and social-psychological characteristics already considered gives some support to this position. A third possibility is that the objective tests used were not a good measure of learning and that either the attenders or the non-attenders would have a significantly higher score if a better measure were used. The data treated in the next chapter give some support to this third position.

ATTENDANCE, RELATIVE PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSOR  
(Composite Figures for First Quarter Sociology)

TABLE 38

|              | A          | NA         | e |
|--------------|------------|------------|---|
| S $\geq$ GPA | 186<br>48% | 112<br>52% | 4 |
| S < GPA      | 200<br>52% | 104<br>48% | 4 |
|              | 386        | 216        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.7443; p < .5$$

TABLE 39

|              | Professor 1 |           | e |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|---|
|              | A           | NA        |   |
| S $\geq$ GPA | 84<br>51%   | 48<br>49% | 2 |
| S < GPA      | 82<br>49%   | 49<br>51% | 2 |
|              | 116         | 97        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.0306; p < .9$$

TABLE 40

|              | Professor 2 |           | e |
|--------------|-------------|-----------|---|
|              | A           | NA        |   |
| S $\geq$ GPA | 102<br>46%  | 64<br>53% | 7 |
| S < GPA      | 118<br>54%  | 55<br>47% | 7 |
|              | 220         | 119       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 1.7005; p < .2$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S  $\geq$  GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-I = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

TABLE 41  
ATTENDANCE AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE  
(Composite Figures for Second Quarter of Sociology)

|                     | A         | NA        | e |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---|
| $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | 49<br>52% | 43<br>43% | 9 |
| $S < \text{GPA}$    | 45<br>48% | 58<br>57% | 9 |
|                     | 94        | 101       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 1.7831; p < .2$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender;  $S \geq \text{GPA}$  = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S < \text{GPA}$  = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

## ATTENDANCE, PERFORMANCE AND TYPE OF LEARNING

As noted in the preceding chapter, there was no significant difference in the relative performance of the composites of attenders and non-attenders in our sample of 602 students in first quarter introductory sociology or the sample of 195 students in second quarter. Three possible explanations were mentioned, one of which related to the type of tests used.

Without knowing any relationships which would be found among the variables being studied, in the second year of data collecting the researchers became curious about the testing instruments being used and undertook an analysis of the questions on the final examination. Guided by the thinking of A. Montgomery Johnston,<sup>1</sup> they analyzed the questions on the final examination and found that almost all the questions could be classified as conceptual, factual or generalizing.

The three were defined as follows:

A fact: an actual and specific event. (e.g., John is an American.)

A concept: the sum of a person's ideas about something. (e.g., My concept of an American is all I know about him.)

A generalization: a statement of relationship between two concepts. (e.g., America has made important contributions to world history.)

Three graduate students in education who were acquainted with Johnston's categories were asked to classify each multiple choice and true-false item on the final examination. If two or all three judges agreed, their classification was accepted. If the three differed, the item was discarded. Out of 100 items (fifty true-false and fifty multiple choice) five of each were discarded because of lack of agreement. The multiple choice items were given a weighting of 2, the true-false a weighting of 1. The result was a possible score of 45 points on factual, 43 points on conceptual and 47 points on generalizing. The final examination for each of 266 students

---

<sup>1</sup>A. Montgomery Johnston, "Teaching The Social Sciences Content" in The Elementary School: Principles and Problems, ed. Joe L. Frost and Thomas Rowland (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969), pp. 454-455.

was graded separately on each of these types of questions, and the grade was multiplied by the appropriate weighting factor to convert it to a base of 100.

The grade for each of these 266 students was punched on his IBM card. Attenders and non-attenders were compared on performance in each of these three types of learning. The means for attenders and non-attenders were compared using the t test as an indication of significance. The distributions on each were compared using F as a indicator of significance.

The means of non-attenders were higher on factual and conceptual--material which could be memorized. The mean for attenders was higher on generalizing--relationships involving broader understanding. (Table 42). These means were not different at the .05 level of significance but they do suggest the possibility that attenders and non-attenders are engaged in different types of learning, or are learning different types of material.

The distributions for factual and generalizing were significantly different. To give an idea of the differences in distribution, the percentages of attenders and non-attenders in each quartile for each type of learning are indicated in Table 43. On conceptual learning 34 students had the grade 84, which resulted in considerable difference in the size of the quartiles.

Many interesting differences in the distribution for attenders and non-attenders are evident. For example, on factual and generalizing learning 24% of the attenders are in quartile 4.

For the non-attenders, 31% are in quartile 4 on factual learning but only 21% on generalizing learning.

The data at hand do not permit us to reach any firm conclusions about differences in types of learning. But they do indicate a need for careful attention to test construction in terms of the objectives of the course and for research on this point with a larger number of subjects.

TABLE 42

TYPE OF LEARNING: MEANS FOR ATTENDERS AND NON-ATTENDERS

| Type of Learning | Mean  |       | t       | Probability |
|------------------|-------|-------|---------|-------------|
|                  | A     | NA    |         |             |
| Factual          | 63.07 | 65.33 | 1.1584  | .1 > p < .2 |
| Conceptual       | 73.42 | 74.04 | 0.37117 | .8 < p > .7 |
| Generalizing     | 76.64 | 75.89 | 0.61596 | .6 > p < .5 |

TABLE 43

## TYPES OF LEARNING: DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES BY QUARTILES

## Factual Learning for Attenders and Non-Attenders

|    | Q <sub>1</sub> | Q <sub>2</sub> | Q <sub>3</sub> | Q <sub>4</sub> |      |
|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------|
| A  | 23.            | 28.            | 26.            | 24.            | 101% |
| NA | 16.            | 33.            | 20.            | 31.            | 100% |
| N  | 54             | 79             | 63             | 60             | 266  |

F for distribution = 1.282;  $p < .1$

## Conceptual Learning for Attenders and Non-Attenders

|    | Q <sub>1</sub> | Q <sub>2</sub> | Q <sub>3</sub> | Q <sub>4</sub> |     |
|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|
| A  | 27.            | 22.            | 17.            | 33.            | 99% |
| NA | 22.            | 21.            | 27.            | 28.            | 98% |
| N  | 68             | 58             | 56             | 84             | 266 |

F for distribution = 1.016;  $p \geq .1$

## Generalizing Learning for Attenders and Non-Attenders

|    | Q <sub>1</sub> | Q <sub>2</sub> | Q <sub>3</sub> | Q <sub>4</sub> |      |
|----|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------|
| A  | 23.            | 27.            | 25.            | 24.            | 99%  |
| NA | 30.            | 21.            | 28.            | 21.            | 100% |
| N  | 68             | 67             | 69             | 62             | 266  |

F for distribution = 1.355;  $p < .05$

## STUDENT REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS

Some items in the second questionnaire inquired about the students' study practices for this course and other items asked for experience and evaluations. The questionnaire was given after the second test and before the final examination. It was administered by a representative of the University's Learning Resources Center, with the professor absent. The completed questionnaires were retained by the Learning Resources Center until the professors had reported their grades, thus assuring that the students' reports and evaluations would not influence their final grades.

Attendees reported that they studied more hours and more regularly than non-attendees. (Tables 44, 47). The reported amount of study time had no significant relation to relative performance. (Tables 45, 46). An even greater difference between attendees and non-attendees was reported in frequency of study. For both attendees and non-attendees there was a negative relationship between reported study frequency and relative performance. (Tables 48, 49), with  $p < .05$  for attendees and slightly greater for non-attendees. One can only conclude that by the time students reach college many have discovered that with little and infrequent study (cramming) they can perform up to their own standard.

Attendees and non-attendees were asked slightly different questions about friendships formed as a result of attending class or non-attending. The attendees were equally divided on positive and negative responses. The non-attendees answered more in the negative. When these responses are related to relative performance, a strong positive relationship is found for the attendees and no relation for the non-attendees. (Tables 50, 51).

The non-attendees were asked several questions regarding the influence of non-attending upon time use. (Questions II, 32-35). Their report: 54% stated that they studied other courses more; 51% reported more time in profitable reading; 18% earned more at a paid occupation; 48% spent more time in athletics. Only the first of these has a significant relation to relative performance. Those who studied other courses more were less likely to have  $\text{Soc} \geq \text{GPA}$ . (Table 52).

Attendees were not pleased with the influence of their decision upon their test grades, whereas non-attendees were.

# HOURS OF STUDY, ATTENDANCE AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

(QII-8)

TABLE 44

|            | A          | NA         | e  |
|------------|------------|------------|----|
| Less Hours | 156<br>41% | 146<br>48% | 27 |
| More Hours | 229<br>59% | 70<br>32%  | 27 |
|            | 385        | 216        |    |

$$\chi^2 = 40.5683; p < .001$$

TABLE 45

|            | A            |            | e |
|------------|--------------|------------|---|
|            | S $\geq$ GPA | S < GPA    |   |
| Less Hours | 76<br>41%    | 80<br>40%  | 1 |
| More Hours | 110<br>59%   | 119<br>60% | 1 |
|            | 186          | 199        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.0173; p < .90$$

TABLE 46

|            | NA           |           | e |
|------------|--------------|-----------|---|
|            | S $\geq$ GPA | S < GPA   |   |
| Less Hours | 78<br>70%    | 68<br>65% | 5 |
| More Hours | 34<br>30%    | 36<br>35% | 5 |
|            | 112          | 104       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.4464; p < .7$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S  $\geq$  GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

# STUDY FREQUENCY, ATTENDANCE AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

(QII-9)

TABLE 47

|            | A          | NA         | e  |
|------------|------------|------------|----|
| Less Freq. | 112<br>29% | 136<br>63% | 34 |
| More Freq. | 273<br>71% | 80<br>37%  | 34 |
|            | 385        | 216        |    |

$$\chi^2 = 65.5006; p < .001$$

TABLE 48

|            | A            |            | e |
|------------|--------------|------------|---|
|            | S $\geq$ GPA | S $<$ GPA  |   |
| Less Freq. | 63<br>34%    | 49<br>25%  | 9 |
| More Freq. | 123<br>66%   | 150<br>75% | 9 |
|            | 186          | 199        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 3.9859; p < .05$$

TABLE 49

|            | NA           |           | e  |
|------------|--------------|-----------|----|
|            | S $\geq$ GPA | S $<$ GPA |    |
| Less Freq. | 77<br>69%    | 59<br>57% | 12 |
| More Freq. | 35<br>31%    | 45<br>43% | 12 |
|            | 112          | 104       |    |

$$\chi^2 = 3.3406; p < .10$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S  $\geq$  GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S  $<$  GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

# FORMING FRIENDSHIPS, ATTENDANCE AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

TABLE 50 (QII-45)

|     |            | A                   |                  | e |
|-----|------------|---------------------|------------------|---|
|     |            | $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | $S < \text{GPA}$ |   |
| Yes | 102<br>56% | 89<br>45%           | 11               |   |
| No  | 81<br>44%  | 109<br>55%          | 11               |   |
|     |            | 183                 | 198              |   |

$$\chi^2 = 4.4274; p < .05$$

TABLE 51 (QII-38)

|     |           | NA                  |                  | e |
|-----|-----------|---------------------|------------------|---|
|     |           | $S \geq \text{GPA}$ | $S < \text{GPA}$ |   |
| Yes | 49<br>44% | 40<br>39%           | 5                |   |
| No  | 63<br>56% | 63<br>61%           | 5                |   |
|     |           | 112                 | 103              |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.5343; p < .5$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S ≥ GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

RELATIVE PERFORMANCE OF NON-ATTENDERS WHO REPORTED  
STUDYING OTHER COURSES MORE

(QI-32)

TABLE 52

|     | S $\geq$ GPA | S < GPA   | e |
|-----|--------------|-----------|---|
| Yes | 49<br>44%    | 40<br>39% | 5 |
| No  | 63<br>56%    | 63<br>61% | 5 |
|     | 112          | 103       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.5343; p < .5$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S  $\geq$  GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

Only 37% of attenders thought that they had made better test grades by attending, but 65% of non-attenders felt they had made as good test grades as if attending. The students whose Soc  $\geq$  GPA held these beliefs in larger proportion. (Tables 53,54).

The final question for both attenders and non-attenders was: Knowing what you now know, if you had the choice to make again would you choose to be an "attender" / "non-attender"? The majority of both responded "yes," but the proportion for non-attenders was much greater. (Table 55). As regards relative performance, among attenders there was a positive relation between a yes response and Soc  $\geq$  GPA, but no relation among non-attenders. (Tables 56, 57).

When this response is related to GPA the reverse is found with an interesting variation. (Tables 58, 59). There is no relation for attenders and a strong positive relation for non-attenders. From these last four tables it can be surmised that attenders with Soc  $<$  GPA were disappointed that attendance had not resulted in a better grade. Also, that non-attenders with high GPA may have felt that they had missed something by not attending class. Or were they merely concerned that a majority of them had S  $<$  GPA? (Table 6, Chapter 3).

# TEST GRADES, ATTENDANCE AND RELATIVE PERFORMANCE

TABLE 53

Thought Made Better  
Grades (QII-42)

A

S ≥ GPA S < GPA

|     |            |            |   |
|-----|------------|------------|---|
|     |            |            | e |
| Yes | 76<br>42%  | 64<br>33%  | 9 |
| No  | 106<br>58% | 132<br>67% | 9 |
|     | 182        | 196        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 3.3550; p < .10$$

TABLE 54

Thought Made as  
Good Grades (QII-37)

NA

S ≥ GPA S < GPA

|     |           |           |    |
|-----|-----------|-----------|----|
|     |           |           | e  |
| Yes | 80<br>72% | 60<br>59% | 13 |
| No  | 31<br>28% | 42<br>41% | 13 |
|     | 111       | 102       |    |

$$\chi^2 = 4.1418; p < .05$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S ≥ GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

WOULD YOU MAKE THE SAME DECISION ON ATTENDANCE AGAIN?

(QII-39,46)

TABLE 55

|     | A          | NA         | e  |
|-----|------------|------------|----|
| Yes | 199<br>53% | 180<br>84% | 31 |
| No  | 180<br>47% | 35<br>16%  | 31 |
|     | 379        | 215        |    |

$$\chi^2 = 57.8231; p < .001$$

TABLE 56

|     | A          |            | e  |
|-----|------------|------------|----|
|     | S ≥ GPA    | S < GPA    |    |
| Yes | 105<br>58% | 94<br>47%  | 11 |
| No  | 76<br>42%  | 104<br>53% | 11 |
|     | 181        | 198        |    |

$$\chi^2 = 4.2095; p < .05$$

TABLE 57

|     | NA        |           | e |
|-----|-----------|-----------|---|
|     | S ≥ GPA   | S < GPA   |   |
| Yes | 93<br>83% | 87<br>84% | 1 |
| No  | 19<br>17% | 16<br>16% | 1 |
|     | 112       | 103       |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.0805; p < .8$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender; S ≥ GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA; S < GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

WOULD YOU MAKE THE SAME DECISION ON ATTENDANCE AGAIN?

(QII-39, 46)

TABLE 58

|     |  | A        |            | e |
|-----|--|----------|------------|---|
|     |  | GPA 1-50 | GPA 51-100 |   |
| Yes |  | 136      | 63         | 1 |
|     |  | 53%      | 52%        |   |
| No  |  | 121      | 59         | 1 |
|     |  | 47%      | 48%        |   |
|     |  | 257      | 122        |   |

$$\chi^2 = 0.0543; p < .90$$

TABLE 59

|     |  | NA       |            | e  |
|-----|--|----------|------------|----|
|     |  | GPA 1-50 | GPA 51-100 |    |
| Yes |  | 77       | 26         | 31 |
|     |  | 43%      | 74%        |    |
| No  |  | 103      | 9          | 31 |
|     |  | 57%      | 26%        |    |
|     |  | 180      | 35         |    |

$$\chi^2 = 11.6564; p < .001$$

A = Attender; NA = Non-Attender;  $S \geq$  GPA = Sociology percentile rank is higher than GPA;  $S <$  GPA = the opposite; QI-1 = first questionnaire, first question, etc. (See Appendix for precise form of questions.)

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Regular class attendance is the conventional practice at the University of Tennessee. The decision to be a non-attender thus involved choice of an unconventional practice. Those who made this choice were more likely to be children of fathers with high-status occupations who had been in college two quarters or longer; lived in a rented room or apartment with others, attended church once or less per month and perceived themselves as other than studious. (Tables 13, 16, 19, 22, 25). The non-attenders stated that they studied fewer hours and less frequently, and they indicated that they would make the same decision again in higher proportion than the attenders. (Tables 43, 46, 54). This commitment to make the same choice again was the same for non-attenders whether the student had  $S \geq$  GPA or not, whereas for non-attenders there was a significant difference. (Tables 55, 56). However, the non-attenders with high GPA, in a proportion significantly higher than those with low GPA, stated that they would not make the same choice again. (Table 58). These facts give a fairly good profile of the student who chose to be a non-attender and how he felt about the decision at the end of the course (but before he received his final grade).

The non-attenders who had  $S \geq$  GPA are designated as "successful non-attenders." They are characterized by high ACT, low GPA, high standing in sociology, high family mobility (many different homes), low church attendance, late and infrequent errand running as children. (Tables 3, 6, 9, 12, 24, 30, 33, 36). They reported that they did not study other courses more than they would have if they had been attenders and they thought they made as good grades as they would have if attending. (Tables 51, 53).

There was no significant difference between the proportion of students of Prof. 1 and Prof. 2 who decided to be attenders, nor was there a significant difference in the relative performance of students of the two professors. However, when this comparison was made adding sex as an additional variable, a significant interaction effect was disclosed. This indicates further the importance of individual differences to the classroom relationship.

The above facts are all related to relative performance on true-false and multiple choice tests containing a variety of items. When the items were classified as factual, conceptual

or generalizing and 266 students were graded on these parts of the final examination, it was found that the non-attenders had higher average (mean) scores on factual and conceptual learning and the attenders had a higher mean score on generalized learning. The means for attenders and non-attenders were not significantly different, but the distributions of factual and generalizing scores were significant. These latter findings are based upon scores for only 266 students on about thirty items for each type of learning. The findings suggest the possibility that attenders and non-attenders may be acquiring different types of learning.

For modern mass education some form of objective examining seems to be necessary, especially in introductory courses. The findings on types of learning, though not conclusive, suggest the need for further research on the type of learning measured by objective tests.

The mean grades for attenders and non-attenders of this study were not significantly different, as was true in the other studies mentioned in Chapter 1. However, the other findings of this research emphasize that the summary statement, "there is no significant difference in performance, regardless of the number of class meetings, etc.," is an over-simplification. For example, in this research some characteristics of successful and unsuccessful non-attenders have been indicated. What would have happened to the unsuccessful if they had attended we do not know.

A next step might be to permit students to request permission to be non-attenders and to give approval only to those who approximate our profile of the successful non-attender. With such an arrangement a high proportion of students with success in relative performance ( $S \geq \text{GPA}$ ) would be expected. There would also be a saving of students' and professors' time, and hopefully, more attention to the students who attend regularly.

#### REFERENCES

- Bradby, Edward, The University Outside Europe, London: Oxford University Press, 1939, pp. 58-59.
- Braude, Jacob M., Speakers Encyclopedia of Stories, Quotations and Anecdotes. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955, p. 133.
- Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row, 1958, p. 81.
- Coleman, James S., Introduction to Mathematical Sociology. New York: Free Press, 1964.
- Coleman, James S., and Leon S. Robertson, "Multivariate Analysis," seminar at The John Hopkins University, December, 1965.
- Johnston, A. Montgomery, "Teaching the Social Sciences Content," Joe L. Frost and Thomas Rowland (eds.), Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969, pp. 454-455.
- Robertson, Leon S., personal correspondence, January, 1966.
- Siegel, Laurence and Lila C. Siegel, "A Multivariate Paradigm for Educational Reserach," Psychological Bulletin, 68:5, pp. 306-326.
- Stevenson, Burton (ed.), The Home Book of Quotations: Classical and Modern. New York: Dodd, Meade and Co., 1956, p. 2069.

APPENDIX A

SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT

As a student in Sociology \_\_\_\_\_, Section \_\_\_\_\_, I understand that each student may choose to be a non-attender of class meetings or a regular attender.

In choosing to be a non-attender, I understand that after the first week of classes, I will not attend class except for the two (2) tests and the final examination on the dates scheduled.

If my grade on the first test is poor it will be my privilege to change to become a regular class attender if I wish.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Knoxville Address \_\_\_\_\_

Knoxville Tele. No. \_\_\_\_\_

In choosing to be a regular attender, I understand that I am expected to attend every class period prepared to discuss and answer questions on the material assigned.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Knoxville Address \_\_\_\_\_

Knoxville Tele. No. \_\_\_\_\_

(Sign in only one of the blanks above)

## APPENDIX B

### I

#### SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

The purpose of this study is to examine variations in human behavior as they are related to the learning process. This is not a test. There are a few questions of fact, but there are no "right" or "wrong" answers for most of the questions. For these the only "right" answer is your feeling or your opinion. Thus your first impression is usually your best answer.

We assure you that all the information which you give will be kept strictly confidential. A code number will be assigned and this sheet removed before the data are examined. In this manner, your answers will not be associated with you in any way.

Read each question carefully and check only one of the several possible answers to each question, unless instructed to do otherwise. Please answer each question.

Thank you very much.

Your name \_\_\_\_\_

Number to be  
assigned later

SOCIOLOGY \_\_\_\_\_; SECTION \_\_\_\_\_;  
QUARTER \_\_\_\_\_; DAYS & HOURS \_\_\_\_\_.

1. What is your sex?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ male

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ female

2. Marital status

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ single

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ married

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ separated

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ divorced

(5) \_\_\_\_\_ widowed

3. What is your age? (Last birthday)

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ 17  
and below

(5) \_\_\_\_\_ 21

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ 18

(6) \_\_\_\_\_ 22

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ 19

(7) \_\_\_\_\_ 23

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ 20

(8) \_\_\_\_\_ 24  
or over

4. What is your religious preference?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ Baptist

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ Methodist

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ Presbyterian

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ Episcopal

- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ Catholic
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ Jewish
- (7) \_\_\_\_\_ None of these: it is \_\_\_\_\_
- (8) \_\_\_\_\_ No preference
5. On the average, how often do you attend church services and activities?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ less than once per month
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ once per month
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ twice per month
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ three times per month
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ four times per month
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ five to eight times per month
- (7) \_\_\_\_\_ over eight times per month
6. How far did your father go in school?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ eighth grade or less
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ some high school, but did not finish
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ high school graduate
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ some college, but did not finish
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ college graduate
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ post graduate or professional training after college
7. How many quarters of college work have you completed prior to this quarter (including work done elsewhere): \_\_\_\_\_
8. What is the population of the town or city in which you make your home?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ under 10,000
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ from 10,000 to 50,000

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ I live in the country

10. What is (or was) your father's job?

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ operates a machine in a factory, or drives a truck, etc.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ salesman, clerk in a store or office

(6) \_\_\_\_\_ professional (doctor, lawyer, teacher, engineer, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ owner \_\_\_\_\_ operates  
for share

11. How many brothers and sisters do you have?

(5) five

(6)          six

(7)        seven

(8) \_\_\_\_\_ eight or more

12. What is the position of your birth in relation to your brothers and sisters?

(5)            fifth

(6)          sixth

(7) \_\_\_\_\_ seventh or over

(8) \_\_\_\_\_ only child

13. How many older brothers do you have? (Circle the number)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

14. How many younger brothers do you have? (Circle the number)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

15. How many older sisters do you have? (Circle the number)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

16. How many younger sisters do you have? (Circle the number)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

17. How old were you when you first earned some money except from your parents?

(1) I was \_\_\_\_\_ years old.

(2) I never have earned money from persons other than my parents.

18. How old were you when you first had a job away from home lasting for a week or more (even if you lived at home)?

(1) I was \_\_\_\_\_ years old.

(2) I have never had a job away from home lasting for as long as a week \_\_\_\_\_.

19. How often did your mother (or father) send you to the store alone to buy things or on other errands?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ frequently

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ sometimes

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ not very often

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ never

20. How old were you when your parents first started sending you on errands?

(1) I was \_\_\_\_\_ years old.

(2) I was never sent on errands \_\_\_\_\_.

21. From the time that you were born until you reached 18 (until the present, if you are not yet 18) your family lived in the following number of different houses. \_\_\_\_\_
22. When you study, do you usually prefer to study:
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ with someone else studying the same material
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ with someone else present, but not studying the same material
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_ alone with radio or television on
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_ alone with a minimum of noise
23. What sports or hobbies do you like best?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_
24. In general, on what things do you prefer to spend most of your time?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_
25. Suppose that you are scheduled to take a college entrance examination in the room with 30 other students. The start of the exam is unavoidably delayed one hour. How would you prefer to spend this time while waiting for the exam to begin:
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ I would very much prefer being alone.
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ I would prefer being alone.
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_ I would slightly prefer being alone.
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_ I would slightly prefer being together with others.
  - (5) \_\_\_\_\_ I would prefer being together with others.
  - (6) \_\_\_\_\_ I would very much prefer being together with others.

26. It has been found that many high school students conform predominately to one of the following types. Please mark the one into which you think you should have been classified during your senior year in high school.

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ The social leader. (Such students conform more to teenage mores than to teachers' expectations.)
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ The high-achieving studious. (Such students put their school work ahead of pleasure.)
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ The creative intellectual. (Such students do not conform to teacher's standards or to teenage mores. They are independent and their class grades are usually lower than their ability test grades.)
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ The Rebel. (Such students are non-conformists, more extreme than the creative intellectuals. They show dislike for regimentation for all types.)
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ I was not like any of the above.

I was \_\_\_\_\_

27. If a good friend strongly recommended to me a medicine for a headache, I would try the medicine as my friend suggested.

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ definitely yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ probably yes
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ possibly yes
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ possibly no
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ probably no
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ definitely no

28. What is your most important goal in attending college?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ To learn to enjoy life
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ To develop my mind and intellectual abilities
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ To secure vocational or professional training
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ To make a desirable marriage
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ To earn a high income

- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ To develop moral standards
- (7) \_\_\_\_\_ To become a cultured person
- (8) \_\_\_\_\_ To develop my personality
- (9) \_\_\_\_\_ To develop a satisfying philosophy
- (10) \_\_\_\_\_ None of these

29. What is your second most important goal in attending college?

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ To learn how to enjoy life
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ To develop my mind and intellectual abilities
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ To secure vocational or professional training
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ To make a desirable marriage
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ To earn a higher income
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ To develop moral standards
- (7) \_\_\_\_\_ To become a cultured person
- (8) \_\_\_\_\_ To develop my personality
- (9) \_\_\_\_\_ To develop a satisfying philosophy
- (10) \_\_\_\_\_ None of these

30. I would try the drug if I knew that it had the approval of well-known physicians and drug companies.

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ definitely yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ probably yes
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ possibly yes
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ possibly no
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ probably no
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ definitely no

31. There are two kinds of people in the world: the weak and the strong.

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ agree a little
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree a little
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree

32. I would take the drug if approved by my physician.

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ definitely yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ probably yes
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ possibly yes
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ possibly no
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ probably no
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ definitely no

33. The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents.

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ agree a little
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree a little
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree

34. I try to avoid taking any medication that is not absolutely necessary.

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ definitely yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ probably yes

(3)\_\_\_\_\_possibly yes

(4)\_\_\_\_\_possibly no

(5)\_\_\_\_\_probably no

(6)\_\_\_\_\_definitely no

35. Prison is too good for sex criminals; they should be publicly whipped or worse.

(1)\_\_\_\_\_strongly agree

(2)\_\_\_\_\_agree

(3)\_\_\_\_\_agree a little

(4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree a little

(5)\_\_\_\_\_disagree

(6)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

36. If I have a headache, I'll try to get rid of it by rest or fresh air before taking a headache remedy.

(1)\_\_\_\_\_definitely yes

(2)\_\_\_\_\_probably yes

(3)\_\_\_\_\_possibly yes

(4)\_\_\_\_\_possibly no

(5)\_\_\_\_\_probably no

(6)\_\_\_\_\_definitely no

37. Any good leader should be strict with people under him in order to gain their respect.

(1)\_\_\_\_\_strongly agree

(2)\_\_\_\_\_agree

(3)\_\_\_\_\_agree a little

(4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree a little

(5)\_\_\_\_\_disagree

(6)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

38. People who come to rely on medications are not as "strong willed" as those who can get by without them.

(1)\_\_\_\_\_strongly agree

(2)\_\_\_\_\_agree

(3)\_\_\_\_\_agree a little

(4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree a little

(5)\_\_\_\_\_disagree

(6)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

39. No decent man can respect a woman who has had sex relations before marriage.

(1)\_\_\_\_\_strongly agree

(2)\_\_\_\_\_agree

(3)\_\_\_\_\_agree a little

(4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree a little

(5)\_\_\_\_\_disagree

(6)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

40. Medicines may be necessary in some cases, but well-adjusted people are usually able to do without them.

(1)\_\_\_\_\_strongly agree

(2)\_\_\_\_\_agree

(3)\_\_\_\_\_agree a little

(4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree a little

(5)\_\_\_\_\_disagree

(6)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

41. While you are a student at U. T., do you live:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ with you parents at home
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ with your husband or wife
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ in a university dormitory
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ in a fraternity house
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_ in an apartment or rented room with one or more other people
- (6) \_\_\_\_\_ in an apartment or rented room alone
- (7) \_\_\_\_\_ other. Specify \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX C

PART II

SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

The purpose of this study is to examine variations in human behavior as they are related to the learning process. This is not a test. There are a few questions of fact, but there are no "right" or "wrong" answers for most of the questions. For these the only "right" answer is your feeling or your opinion. Thus, your first impression is usually your best answer.

We assure you that all the information which you give will be kept strictly confidential. A code number will be assigned and this sheet removed before the data are examined. In this manner, your answers will not be associated with you in any way.

Read each question carefully and check only one of the several possible answers to each question, unless instructed to do otherwise. Please answer each question.

Thank you very much.

Your name \_\_\_\_\_

Number to be  
assigned later

SOCIOLOGY \_\_\_\_\_; SECTION \_\_\_\_\_;  
QUARTER \_\_\_\_\_; DAYS & HOURS \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Suppose that: (1) your essential needs are already cared for, (2) someone sends you a check for \$100, and (3) provides that you use it in one of the ways listed below. Which would you choose? Check only one.
  - (1) \_\_\_\_\_ save it for future needs
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ have a party for some of your friends
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_ use it for religious purposes or charity
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_ buy books, paintings, or statuary
2. Which of the following do you believe to be the most important and desirable qualities in an adult?
  - (1) \_\_\_\_\_ to be honest and accurate
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ to be considerate and agreeable
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_ to be obedient and respectful
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_ to be alert and mentally inquisitive
3. Do you most respect a leader who in time of crisis: (check only one)
  - (1) \_\_\_\_\_ reduces tensions and seeks agreement among the differing persons
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ speaks out for a right and just solution to the problem
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_ goes to a higher authority for guidance and help
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_ looks for an intellectual or scientific solution
4. In discussion of a critical social issue do you think that a person should? Check only one.
  - (1) \_\_\_\_\_ say what he thinks is right
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ take a position which would not offend others present

- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ leave such issues to higher authorities in church or government
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ hope that scientists will find a solution to the problem
5. If family obligations or other considerations did not restrict your choice, which of the following types of occupations would you prefer to spend your life in?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ one which permitted you to be thrifty and accumulate some wealth
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ one which permitted you to have friendly, congenial contacts with other people
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ one in which your rights and obligations were fixed so that you would not have to make decisions often
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ one which would permit you to gain artistic or intellectual recognition
6. Among great figures in American history, do you have greatest admiration for:
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ a military leader who takes the position: "Damn the torpedoes. Full speed ahead!"
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ a national leader who takes the position: "Let us bind up the nation's wounds; let us have peace."
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ a national leader who takes the position: "Only by divine guidance can this nation be saved."
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ an intellectual diplomat who endeavors to out-manuever his foreign opponents.
7. If you were given the choice of reading the biography of a great man, would you prefer to read about one who:
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ was a great intellectual man, scientist, or scholar
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ was a great business leader or tycoon
- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ was a great religious man or saint
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_ was a great compromiser, peacemaker, or adjuster of human situations

8. How much time did you average weekly studying sociology (excluding class time)?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ less than one hour
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ one to two hours
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_ three to four hours
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_ five to six hours
  - (5) \_\_\_\_\_ seven to eight hours
9. How regularly did you study for this course?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ studied some every day
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ studied every other day
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_ studied once per week
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_ studied just before tests
  - (5) \_\_\_\_\_ did not study regularly
  - (6) \_\_\_\_\_ did not study
10. Did you study for this course?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ alone
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ with "attenders"
  - (3) \_\_\_\_\_ with "non-attenders"
  - (4) \_\_\_\_\_ with both "attenders" and "non-attenders"
  - (5) \_\_\_\_\_ did not study
11. Have you taken introductory sociology before this quarter?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ yes
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ no
12. Your father's religious affiliation (preference) is/was?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ Baptist
  - (2) \_\_\_\_\_ Methodist

(3)\_\_\_\_Presbyterian

(4)\_\_\_\_Episcopal

(5)\_\_\_\_Catholic

(6)\_\_\_\_Jewish

(7)\_\_\_\_Other

13. Would you say that your father's belief in his religion is/was?

(1)\_\_\_\_strong

(2)\_\_\_\_medium

(3)\_\_\_\_weak

14. Your mother's religious affiliation (preference) is/was?

(1)\_\_\_\_Baptist

(2)\_\_\_\_Methodist

(3)\_\_\_\_Presbyterian

(4)\_\_\_\_Episcopal

(5)\_\_\_\_Catholic

(6)\_\_\_\_Jewish

(7)\_\_\_\_Other

15. Would you say that your mother's belief in her religion is/was?

(1)\_\_\_\_strong

(2)\_\_\_\_medium

(3)\_\_\_\_weak

16. The most valuable talent a person can have is the ability to get along with others.

(1)\_\_\_\_strongly agree

(2)\_\_\_\_agree

- (3)\_\_\_\_undecided  
(4)\_\_\_\_disagree  
(5)\_\_\_\_strongly disagree
17. One should be concerned more about one's achievements than about making friends.
- (1)\_\_\_\_strongly agree  
(2)\_\_\_\_agree  
(3)\_\_\_\_undecided  
(4)\_\_\_\_disagree  
(5)\_\_\_\_strongly disagree
18. I believe that being able to make friends is a great accomplishment in and of itself.
- (1)\_\_\_\_strongly agree  
(2)\_\_\_\_agree  
(3)\_\_\_\_undecided  
(4)\_\_\_\_disagree  
(5)\_\_\_\_strongly disagree
19. One should hold on to his opinions even though they may be radically different from those of others.
- (1)\_\_\_\_strongly agree  
(2)\_\_\_\_agree  
(3)\_\_\_\_undecided  
(4)\_\_\_\_disagree  
(5)\_\_\_\_strongly disagree
20. You should always stand up for what you think is right.
- (1)\_\_\_\_strongly agree  
(2)\_\_\_\_agree

- (3) \_\_\_\_\_ undecided  
(4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree  
(5) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree
21. I would feel conspicuous if I were not dressed the way most of my friends are dressed.
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ undecided  
(4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree  
(5) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree
22. It is all right to be an individual but I wouldn't want to be very different from those around me.
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ undecided  
(4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree  
(5) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree
23. I like to wear clothes which stress my individuality and are not those which everybody else is wearing.
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ undecided  
(4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree  
(5) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree
24. I'd rather be with a group of friends in my free time than to read an interesting book.
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree  
(2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree

- (3)\_\_\_\_\_undecided
- (4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree
- (5)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

25. As leisure-time activity I would rather choose something you do alone such as painting or photography rather than something you do with people such as play cards or talk.

- (1)\_\_\_\_\_strongly agree
- (2)\_\_\_\_\_agree
- (3)\_\_\_\_\_undecided
- (4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree
- (5)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

26. In bringing up children, parents should look at what other parents do with their children.

- (1)\_\_\_\_\_strongly agree
- (2)\_\_\_\_\_agree
- (3)\_\_\_\_\_undecided
- (4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree
- (5)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

27. In bringing up children, parents should stick to their own ideas about how they want their children brought up regardless of what others do.

- (1)\_\_\_\_\_strongly agree
- (2)\_\_\_\_\_agree
- (3)\_\_\_\_\_undecided
- (4)\_\_\_\_\_disagree
- (5)\_\_\_\_\_strongly disagree

28. Since there are no values which can be eternal, the only real values are those which meet the needs of the given moment.

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ undecided

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree

(5) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree

29. I like situations which are demanding.

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ undecided

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree

(5) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree

30. I like situations which I have to struggle to master.

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly agree

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ agree

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ undecided

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ disagree

(5) \_\_\_\_\_ strongly disagree

NOTICE

NON-ATTENDERS ANSWER QUESTIONS 31-39, (following)  
(add further comments bottom of last page)

ATTENDERS ANSWER QUESTIONS 40-46, (last page)  
(add further comments)

Only Non-Attenders Answer Questions 31 through 39

31. Do you believe that you studied more for this class than you would have done if attending?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ no
32. Do you believe that you studied more for your other courses than you would have if you had attended this class?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ no
33. Do you believe that you spent more time in profitable reading (apart from assignments for this course)?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ no
34. Did you earn more at some paid occupation?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ no
35. Did you spend more time in athletics or other activities?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ no
36. Do you believe you are capable of successful independent study in other fields than sociology?
- (1) \_\_\_\_\_ yes
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ no

If yes, name the fields:

- (1) \_\_\_\_\_
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

(5) \_\_\_\_\_

37. Do you believe you made as good grades on the tests as you would have made if attending?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_yes

(2) \_\_\_\_\_no

38. Did you form any friendships or engage in social activities of value because of the time you saved by not attending class?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_yes

(2) \_\_\_\_\_no

39. Knowing what you know now, if you had the choice to make again, would you choose to be a "non-attender"?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_yes

(2) \_\_\_\_\_no

Give reasons: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

Write at the bottom of the next page any further comments which you have.

Only Attenders Answer Questions 40 through 46

40. Do you believe you studied sociology more hours than you would have studied if not attending?
- (1)\_\_\_\_yes
- (2)\_\_\_\_no
41. Do you believe you studied sociology more regularly than you would have studied if not attending?
- (1)\_\_\_\_yes
- (2)\_\_\_\_no
42. Do you believe that you made better grades on the tests than you would have made if not attending?
- (1)\_\_\_\_yes
- (2)\_\_\_\_no
43. Do you believe that the class lectures and discussions helped you to understand the material covered?
- (1)\_\_\_\_yes
- (2)\_\_\_\_no
44. Did the class meetings provide you with information, understanding, or points of view you would not otherwise have gained?
- (1)\_\_\_\_yes
- (2)\_\_\_\_no
45. Did you form any friendships or personal attachments because of attending class which were valuable to you?
- (1)\_\_\_\_yes
- (2)\_\_\_\_no

46. Knowing what you now know, if you had the choice to make again,  
'would you choose to be an "attender"?

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ yes

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ no

Give reasons: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\* \* \* \* \*

Add any further comments which you have.

## APPENDIX D

### CUTTING POINTS

In reducing the data to form 2 x 2 tables the responses were combined in conformity to similarities which were evident from a preliminary run showing the full distributions. The cutting point between the two categories is shown below for each table where applicable.

- QI-5 First Category (1) and (2); Second Category (3) and above
- QI-7 First Category 0 and 1; Second Category 2 or more
- QI-10 First Category (1) (2) (3) and operates farm for share;  
Second Category (4) (5) (6) and farmer owner
- QI-19 First Category (1); Second Category (2) (3) (4)
- QI-20 First Category 10 or less; Second Category 11 or more
- QI-21 First Category 1-3; Second Category 4 or more
- QI-26 First Category (1) (3) (4); Second Category (2)
- QI-41 First Category (1) (2) (3) (4) (6); Second Category (5)
- QII-8 First Category (1) (2); Second Category (3) and above
- QII-9 First Category (1) (2) (3); Second Category (4) (5) (6)
- QII-21 First Category (1) (2); Second Category (3) (4) (5)